



AF/1774  
IFU

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**BEFORE THE HONORABLE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re the Application of

Patrick CACERES et al.

Application No.: 10/026,629 ✓

Filed: December 27, 2001

On Appeal from Group: 1774

Examiner: T. Dicus

Docket No.: 102549.01

For: COOLING ARTICLE INVOLVING EVAPORATION OF WATER FROM A  
POYMER ABSORBENT

**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A Notification of Non-Compliance was mailed on December 9, 2004, in the above-identified application. However, because the Notification was mailed in error, it should be withdrawn and the October 1, 2004, Appeal Brief should be entered in the record.

The Notification of Non-Compliance states that the Appeal Brief is defective, because it does not include a "Grouping of Claims" section as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.192(c). However, Applicants respectfully point out that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.192(c) are no longer applicable, and such a "Grouping of Claims" section is no longer required.


On September 13, 2004, new Rules of Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences took effect, which replaced the Appeal Brief provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.192 with new provisions set forth in 37 C.F.R. §41.37. See Rules of Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule), 69 Fed. Reg. 49959 (August 12, 2004). See also the attached Clarification of the Effective Date Provision in the Rules of Practice Before

the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule), posted on the USPTO website on September 10, 2004.

Applicants' October 1, 2004, Appeal Brief fully complied with the amended Rules, and included all of the sections and information required by those Rules. Accordingly, the October 1, 2004, Appeal Brief must be entered into the record and considered by the Examiner. No further response to the Notification is deemed necessary.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Response, or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024


Joel S. Armstrong  
Registration No. 36,430

WPB:JSA

Date: December 16, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---



## **Clarification of the Effective Date Provision in the Rules of Practice before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule)**

The effective date provision in the Rules of Practice before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule) (hereinafter BPAI final rule) states that September 13, 2004 is the effective date. See Rules of Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule), 69 Fed. Reg. 49959 (August 12, 2004). The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Office) has received inquiries as to how the effective date provision applies to certain situations. This notice provides clarification as to how the Office is implementing the effective date provision.

Generally, any paper filed by applicants or mailed by the Office on or after September 13, 2004 must comply with the rules as set forth in the BPAI final rule. Appeal briefs filed prior to September 13, 2004 must either comply with former § 1.192 or new § 41.37. A certificate of mailing or transmission in compliance with § 1.8 will be applicable to determine if a paper was filed prior to the effective date of September 13, 2004 in order to determine which rule applies. Examples of certain situations are set forth in the questions and answers below. Additional questions and answers concerning the BPAI final rule are available on the USPTO web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

### **Questions related to Time Periods for Filing of Papers Related to After Final Practice and Ex Parte Appeals:**

#### **Question 1. If a notice of appeal is filed before September 13, 2004, the effective date of the BPAI final rule, when is the appeal brief due?**

If the notice of appeal is filed before September 13, 2004, the time period for filing an appeal brief will be the time period set forth in former § 1.192(a) which provides that the appellant must file an appeal brief: (1) within two months from the date of filing of the notice of appeal; or (2) within the time allowed for reply to the action from which the appeal was taken, if such time is later.

The time period set forth in former § 1.192(a) also applies if the notice of appeal is filed with a certificate of mailing or transmission in compliance with § 1.8 and the date on the certificate of mailing or transmission is before the effective date of September 13, 2004, but the notice of appeal is received by the Office on or after September 13, 2004. The two month time period will begin on the date of receipt of the notice of appeal.

#### **Question 2. If appellant reinstates the appeal after the prosecution is reopened by filing a second notice of appeal on or after the effective date, when is the second appeal brief due?**

Appellant must file the second appeal brief (in compliance with the format and content requirements of § 41.37(c)) within two months from the date of filing the second notice of appeal, even if the first notice of appeal and the first brief were filed before the effective date. The two month time period is extendable under the provisions of § 1.136 for patent applications and § 1.550(c) for *ex parte* reexamination proceedings. See § 41.37(e).

**Question 3. If a notice of appeal is filed on or after the effective date of September 13, 2004, would extensions of time under § 1.136(a) be required when a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under § 1.114 or an amendment is filed after two months from the date of filing the notice of appeal, but within three months from the mailing of the action from which the appeal was taken?**

Yes, extensions of time under § 1.136(a) are required for filing an RCE or amendment after two months from the filing of the notice of appeal, even if the RCE or amendment is filed within the three months from the mailing of the action from which the appeal was taken.

**Questions related to Appeal Brief Contents or Requirements for Papers Filed after Appeal:**

**Question 4. If the notice of appeal is filed before the effective date of September 13, 2004 and the brief is filed by appellant on or after the effective date, would the appeal brief be required to comply with the content and format requirements of § 41.37(c)?**

Yes, any appeal brief filed on or after September 13, 2004 must be in compliance with the requirements set forth in § 41.37(c) and be accompanied by the appropriate fee under § 41.20(b)(2). If the brief does not comply with § 41.37(c), an amended brief will be required under § 41.37(d).

Exception: If the appeal brief is filed with a certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 and the date on the certificate of mailing or transmission is before September 13, 2004, the appeal brief may comply with either former § 1.192 or new § 41.37, even if the appeal brief is received by the Office on or after September 13, 2004.

**Question 5. Would the Office accept an appeal brief filed before the effective date of September 13, 2004 that is in compliance with § 41.37(c)?**

Yes, a brief filed before September 13, 2004 that is compliant with the new § 41.37(c) will be acceptable.

**Question 6. If an appeal brief filed before the effective date of September 13, 2004 fails to comply with the content and format requirements of § 1.192 and the Office mails appellant a Notice that correction is required, would an amended appeal brief filed on or after the effective date be required to be in compliance with § 41.37(c)?**

No, an amended appeal brief, based on an appeal brief originally filed prior to September 13, 2004, would be acceptable if it complies with either former § 1.192 or § 41.37(c), regardless of when the Office mailed a Notice requiring correction of the noncompliant appeal brief.

**Question 7. If, after a final rejection or an appeal, applicant or appellant filed an amendment, affidavit or other evidence on or after the effective date, will the revised or new rules in the BPAI final rule apply?**

Any affidavit or other evidence filed after a final rejection, or an appeal, on or after the effective date, will be subject to the revised or new rules (*i.e.*, the revised § 1.116 or new § 41.33).

**Questions related to Examiner's Answers and Supplemental Examiner's Answers:**

**Question 8. If the appeal brief is filed before the effective date of September 13, 2004, but the examiner's answer is mailed on or after the effective date, can the examiner's answer include a new ground of rejection?**

Yes, an examiner's answer mailed on or after September 13, 2004 may include a new ground of rejection (with Technology Center Director or designee approval) in compliance with § 41.39. Any examiner's answer mailed before September 13, 2004, however, may not include a new ground of rejection. See former § 1.193.

**Question 9. Can the examiner provide a supplemental examiner's answer under § 41.43 on or after the effective date of September 13, 2004 in response to any new issue raised in a reply brief that was filed before the effective date?**

Yes, the examiner may provide a supplemental examiner's answer (with Technology Center Director or designee approval) if it is mailed on or after September 13, 2004 in response to any new issue raised in a reply brief, even if the reply brief was filed before September 13, 2004. Appellant may file another reply brief in compliance with § 41.41 to reply to the supplemental examiner's answer within two months from the date of mailing of the supplemental examiner's answer. Extensions of time under § 1.136(a) are not applicable to the two-month time period.

**Question 10. If the Board remanded an application before the effective date of September 13, 2004 for further consideration of a rejection, and the examiner provides a supplemental examiner's answer on or after the effective date (in response to the remand by the Board), can appellant request that prosecution be reopened under § 41.50(a)(2)(i)?**

No, appellant may not request that prosecution be reopened under § 41.50(a)(2)(i) in response to the supplemental examiner's answer since the Board remanded the application before the effective date. Appellant may request that prosecution be reopened in response to a supplemental examiner's answer written in response to the remand by the Board, only if: (1) the remand is on or after the effective date, and (2) the remand is for further consideration of a rejection. The Board should indicate in the remand if § 41.50(a)(2)(i) applies. Thus, appellant may not request that prosecution be reopened under § 41.50(a)(2)(i) if the remand is for another reason.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kery Fries, Senior Legal Advisor in the Office of Patent Legal Administration, by telephone at (703) 308-6906 or (571) 272-7704 on or after September 29, 2004, or by e-mail addressed to [Kery.Fries@USPTO.gov](mailto:Kery.Fries@USPTO.gov).

/s/ Robert J. Spar, for  
Stephen G. Kunin  
Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy